



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SOME RULING FORCES IN MODERN HISTORY

THIRD ARTICLE: NATIONALISM AND DEMOCRACY, 1850-1914

By H. M. WAGSTAFF, Ph. D.

Professor of European History, The University of North Carolina

AFTER 1850 nationalism swiftly ripened to maturity among the most important groups of people in Europe. In Great Britain the principle was safe past question, Ireland's position as a submerged group in the British Isles only emphasizing the national consciousness of the dominant English. Interest therefore slowly awakened again, after the failure of the Chartist movement in 1850, in the further evolution of democracy. The leaders of the dominant middle class had closed their ears to democracy's demands until the memory of Chartism was dulled. But the death of Palmerston in 1865 marks the beginning of the swing of the national mind toward an honest application of political democracy. The Reform Bill of 1867, a gift of the Conservatives led by Disraeli, was an advance forward that made the Bill of 1884-85 inevitable. The latter measure ushered in universal suffrage and was the proof the Liberals offered, under Gladstone's guidance, that they were the real champions of democracy. Thereafter, of course, no party could be safe that did not endorse the ideal.

In the meantime France, in the role of pace-maker for Europe, had removed the emphasis from democracy in 1851 and placed it upon nationalism. She signaled this by her submission to Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état* by which in that year he subverted the Second Republic and set up the Second Empire. Craftily playing upon the Napoleonic cult in which France was indulging her emotions during the past decade, this shadow of the Great Napoleon lulled Frenchmen into believing, at least temporarily, that he embodied the ideal of French unity for a glorious destiny. This destiny, he claimed, was promised by the First Republic, all but achieved by the First Empire, and now to be realized by uniting the inspiration from both. Imagination pictured France casting off her uncertainty, returning to her true self, erect, strong, masterful, speaking with high authority among the nations, commanding the deference of all. Great traditions must compel a greater future, and France must fulfill her mission in leadership. Unquestionably the nationalistic impulse, fired to white-heat, accounts for France's acceptance for twenty years of this idol with feet of clay, this Third Napoleon who promised so prodigally, performed so craftily, and in the end failed so signally.

Yet all Frenchmen were not beguiled during these

twenty years. The Republican Liberals furnished an irreconcilable element whom Napoleon III must needs watch carefully all the days of his shifty reign. His half-successes they caricatured, his failures they pictured with pitiless truth. In the fear of popular second thought in respect to his title he gave lip-service to democracy but denied its essence. Hence he was necessarily committed to an over-stress of nationalism as the only alternative for bulwarking his throne. In two of the four most notable of the national projects he measurably succeeded and thereby stirred the majority of Frenchmen to patriotic fervor. These were his intervention against Russia¹ in 1854-56, and his intervention against Austria in behalf of Sardinia and Italian nationalism in 1859. Though he drew back in the latter action before his contract with Sardinia was no more than half completed, nevertheless he had unleashed a force in Italy that thereafter dared to press her nationalistic movement to a conclusion. The two other acts of Napoleon, designed also to flatter patriotic nationalism, by illustrating its might to Frenchmen, was the Mexican Venture of 1862-67 and the war with Prussia in 1870. Both were failures, and the last overturned his throne. But had they succeeded, especially the last, the spirit of nationalism they invoked would have carried both Napoleon III and France on to efforts of still greater self-expression.

Napoleon III's intervention against Austrian dominance in the Italian peninsula in 1859 served as a solvent of the vexed question of Italian nationalism which, in its immediate definition, meant Italian unity. Mazzini, the prophet of nationalism in Italy, had for a full quarter of a century past been inculcating the doctrine of democracy as the means of driving out Austria and achieving unity for his countrymen. His ideal and aim was a democratic republic. The society, "Young Italy," founded by him in 1831, was to serve as the motive force, and ever-recurring revolution was to be its weapon.

This persistent idealist stirred all Italy to fervent patriotism, his influence reaching high-tide in the revolutionary year 1848-49 in the temporary establishment

¹In the Crimean War, Russia undertook to scare Turkey, threatening her dismemberment. England and France came to Turkey's rescue, being joined by Sardinia, whom Cavour had moved to action as a part of his plan in Italian unification. See below.

of the Roman Republic in the Papal States. Austria, as we have seen, though shaken in all her parts by the general wave of nationalism and democracy, had not only righted her own house without vital loss, but had succeeded in riveting her yoke anew upon the neck of Italy. Therefore it was apparent that the hand of a practicalist was necessary to guide Italian nationalism to a successful issue.

This need was supplied by Cavour, the statesman of Italian unification. Shaping the liberal energies of Italy that had been so prodigally wasted until now, Cavour directed them to the support of the Kingdom of Sardinia as the hope of Italian liberation, unity, and democracy. This little state in Northern Italy, ruled by the House of Savoy, had become a liberal constitutional monarchy in 1848 and was the one political entity in the peninsula that had shown some self-respect, particularly in resentment of Austrian dominance in Italian affairs. It had stood forth against Austria in 1848-49 only to be defeated in the battles of Custoza and Novara. But she held to her constitution despite her defeat, thus proving her loyalty to liberalism. On this account Sardinia became a rallying point for Italian patriotism. In 1850 her king, Victor Emmanuel II, called Cavour to the task that confronted his state.

Cavour understood the necessary conditions of success in his task. He first of all proceeded to regenerate his own state in an economic sense. He then re-organized her finances and created a modern army. In 1855 he joined England and France in war on Russia in the Crimea, thus securing a seat for himself at the peace table in Paris in 1856. Here he called Europe's attention to Austria as an obstacle to Italy's just aspirations toward unity and liberty. In 1858, by a secret agreement, he induced Napoleon III to unite with Sardinia in war on Austria for the liberation of Venetia and Lombardy, both directly owned by Austria and ruled as a Viceroyalty. The war was fought in 1859, and though Napoleon III drew out after Lombardy alone was freed, the unification movement in Italy now broke all restraint. Lombardy had been annexed to Sardinia at the withdrawal of France. In the following year Tuscany, Parma, Modena, and the Romagna united with her by popular vote. Coincidentally Garibaldi executed his dramatic exploit of overthrowing the Bourbon power² in Southern Italy and held the country in pledge for Victor Emmanuel. Cavour now sent his king south and to annex Umbria

and the Marches (two of the Pope's provinces) on his way to join Garibaldi in Naples. Thus the "Kingdom of Italy" was ready to be proclaimed in February, 1861, and included all Italy except Venetia and Peter's Patrimony, the latter a narrow district containing Rome.³ Venetia was acquired in 1866 by Italy's joining Prussia in the latter's successful war on Austria. Rome was taken over in 1870 when its French garrison was recalled to France during the Franco-Prussian war. A false boundary, drawn to the disadvantage of Italy by Bismarck when Venetia was ceded, still left a residue of Italian population under Austrian rule. This even so slight contravention of the principle of nationality was to have momentous consequences, bearing bitter fruit to both Austria and Germany.⁴

Just as the Kingdom of Italy came into being under the double propulsion of democracy and nationalism, the Germanies were entering the decade wherein the recent German Empire was to be born. William I, King of Prussia, and his great minister, Bismarck, were to use their state to the same end in German affairs as had Victor Emmanuel and Cavour used theirs in Italy. But with this great difference: Sardinia invoked the spirit of democracy in the task of nationalizing Italy, the result being a democratic monarchy in which she merged herself; Prussia remained an autocracy, championed German nationalism as such, and accomplished her end without an appeal to the liberal spirit of democracy.

German nationalism, achieved by Prussia's war against Austria in 1866, and that against France in 1870, created the most powerful European state of modern times. This power was the direct result of the co-ordinated energies of a greatly endowed people guided by an efficient autocracy. The inspiration gathered by the German people from the successful launching of the German Empire in 1861 was to carry them on to mighty efforts to play a high role in history. It is conceivable that these efforts would not have become the despair and fear of the rest of the world had it not in last analysis been based on irresponsible autocracy. To be sure this autocracy commended the support of the majority will, because it was efficient and strong, and so raised their new-born nation to a position and power in the world's affairs to which German imagination had not before ever accustomed itself. There are numerous instances in history of autocratic authority guiding a people's energies to a

² This was the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, composed of the Island of Sicily and Naples on the mainland, and ruled by a branch of the Spanish Bourbons. It was bound to Austria by treaty in such a way as to make it a virtual dependence on that power.

³ The French were garrisoning Rome since 1848 as a result of French Catholic demand that the Pope should be protected in his temporal sovereignty.

⁴ It kept the "Italia Irredenta" question alive and largely accounts for Italy's joining the Entente Powers in 1915.

high success, but no instance where it has guided them to failure without reaction against such authority that oftener than not proved its doom. At least this has proved true since the French Revolution gave rise to the modern concept of popular sovereignty, and therefore popular responsibility. In a democracy a whole people may blunder—they often do—but there is no scapegoat; the whole people must accept its penalty and correct its error. And it is likely to do this, and profit by the experience. Moreover, it is not so likely to enter upon a wrong course as an autocracy, because in the present stage of political and social evolution the wisdom of all the people, acting through responsible government, is greater than the wisdom of any autocracy, however closely identified its interests may be with that of the people it leads. Democracy as a principle of government possesses a vitality and resiliency, therefore, that enables it to absorb the shock of a failure and stabilize it in success. Autocracy is likely to become unbalanced in success and topple over under failure.

POEMS OF PATRIOTISM AND THE LESSONS THEY TEACH

III. TO AMERICA

By ALFRED AUSTIN (1835-1913)

Holding to a strict definition of patriotism as love of one's country, there may be those who do not regard this as a poem of patriotism. But from the larger view-point it will be seen that it is a poem really of the higher patriotism, reflecting as it does not only the poet's deeper love of his native land, England, but even a more abiding devotion to the higher ideals of Anglo-Saxon peoples everywhere, in America as well as in England.

In the light of the world war and of present momentous world events, we deem it appropriate to reproduce the poem at this time since the dream of the poet has found fulfillment. Teachers would do well to have their high school pupils memorize it. Attention should be called to two or three articles that may be read to advantage in connection with it. In the November and December numbers of the JOURNAL we carried a contribution by Mr. Arthur Johnston on "Some Misunderstood Aspects of Anglo-American Relations" which will serve as a good background for the study of the poem. Mr. H. H. Powers's little book, "America and Britain," reviewed in this number of the JOURNAL, will serve admirably for this purpose. We must also call attention to the fine production "*A Virginian in Surry*," which was contributed to the London *Times* by one of our own state poets, Dr. Benjamin Sledd, of Wake Forest College, in which this bit of prophecy is found:

"Comes ever England's hour of woe,
Her children hear beyond the main;
The Mother will not call in vain."

Dr. Sledd's poem was reproduced in the *Wake Forest Student* for November, 1914.

The writer recalls very distinctly an address bearing on this theme delivered before the students of the University

of North Carolina in March, 1899, by the late Dr. Walter H. Page, recent Ambassador to England. His subject was, "The Greater Republic." In the course of his address he spoke somewhat as follows (I paraphrase from memory): "Young gentlemen, there will never be another war between England and America. Do not be deceived or disturbed by the jingo press. Blood is thicker than water. If ever there should come another great war and England should need America's aid, she will have it; and if, on the other hand, America should need England's aid, she will have it." Following the rumblings and the mutterings that had so shortly preceded this, the speaker's declaration came as a surprise to many, if not most, of the students who heard it; and it created considerable discussion. It is interesting to note how his prophecy has found fulfillment in the World War.

Alfred Austin was an English poet, critic and journalist. He was born near Leeds in 1835 and died in 1913. He was made poet-laureate of England in 1896, succeeding Alfred, Lord Tennyson, who died in 1894.—N. W. W.

TO AMERICA*

What is the voice I hear
On the winds of the western sea?
Sentinel, listen from out Cape Clear
And say what the voice may be.
'Tis a proud free people calling loud to a people proud and free.

And it says to them: "Kinsmen, hail!
We severed have been too long.
Now let us have done with a worn-out tale—
The tale of an ancient wrong—
And our friendship last long as our love doth and be stronger
than death is strong."

Answer them, sons of the self-same race,
And blood of the self-same clan;
Let us speak with each other face to face
And answer as man to man,
And loyally love and trust each other as none but free men
can,

Now fling them out to the breeze,
Shamrock, Thistle, and Rose,
And the Star-Spangled Banner unfurl with these—
A message to friends and foes
Wherever the sails of peace are seen and wherever the war-
wind blows—

A message to bond and thrall to wake,
For wherever we come, we twain,
The throne of the tyrant shall rock and quake
And his menace be void and vain;
For you are lords of a strong land and we are lords of the
main.

Yes, this is the voice of the bluff March gale;
We severed have been too long,
But now we have done with a worn-out tale—
The tale of an ancient wrong—
And our friendship last long as love doth last and stronger
than death is strong.

*Reproduced from "Poems Every Child Should Know," published by Doubleday, Page & Co., Garden City, New York.